

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 18, 19 and 21-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,720,014 to Ikeda et al. ("Ikeda"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a data communication system having a notification unit adapted to notify a data processing terminal via a connector. The notification includes transmission result information (representing a document transmission performed by a data transmitter) and the document transmitted by the data transmitter. The notification unit notifies the data processing terminal of the transmission result information related to the document transmission upon completion of the document transmission performed by the data transmitter.

Ikeda relates to an image processing apparatus that can be connected to an information processing terminal. The image processing apparatus comprises interface means for exchanging data with an external information processing terminal, instruction receipt means for receiving an instruction via the interface means from the terminal, and control means for controlling various processes, such as communication, image recording, and image reading, in consonance with the instruction received by the instruction receipt means.

Applicant submits that nothing in Ikeda would teach or suggest notifying a data processing terminal upon completion of the document transmission performed by the data transmitter, where the notification includes transmission result information and the document transmitted by the data transmitter, as recited in Claim 1.

In the Office Action, Ikeda's Communication Management Function and File Management Function together are said to correspond to the notification function recited in Claim 1. Applicant submits that these two functions, even in combination, do not in fact meet the terms of the recitation of the notification function in Claim 1. While the Communication Management Function does provide notification procedures, these procedures merely concern acquisition of communication result information for a designated service ID or a request for a service ID. Neither of these procedures provides a document transmitted by a data transmitter.

On the other hand, the File Management Function involves the management of stored image data based on file management commands, such as a file data acquisition command. However, the retrieval of a data file is performed in response to the file data acquisition command, rather than as part of a transmission result notification performed upon completion of document transmission. Indeed, it is clear from Figs. 27 and 29 that the notification procedure of the Communication Management Function is entirely separate from the file acquisition procedure of the File Management Function. Nowhere does Ikeda suggest that, upon the completion of document transmission, a notification occurs that includes both the transmission result and the transmitted document, in the manner recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Ikeda.

Independent Claims 7, 18, 19, 21-24, 27, and 28 include similar features to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 7, 18, 19, 21-24,

27, and 28 are also believed to be patentable for reasons substantially similar as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Leonard P. Diana", written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant

Leonard P. Diana

Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 395051v1